

Interview Summary	Application N .	Applicant(s)
	09/926,453	TSUJITA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Edward M. Johnson	1754

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Edward M. Johnson.

(3) _____.

(2) Thomas Barnes.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 29 October 2003.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: all pending.

Identification of prior art discussed: all.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant outlined the limitations of the claimed invention and asserted that the claim is patentable over the prior art because of the features of both the product and the process of making. The Examiner noted the product-by-process format of the claim and suggested the possibility of claiming both inventions independently. Applicant also suggested possible amendments to the claims, which the Examiner indicated would be given full consideration upon submission. The Examiner also faxed a copy of the instant Interview Summary to Applicant at Applicant's request.